MITHYA KHANDAN
CONTAINING
THE ORIGIN OF JAINISM.

BY

SRI PREM CHAND,
"LATE NAME, NANAK CHAND"
S. S. JAIN MUNI PUNJABEE,

DISCIPLE OF

SRI SWAMI UDE CHAND JI, "GANI"
S. S. JAIN MUNI.

PUBLISHED FOR
LATE DIWAN KIRPA RAM SAHIB,
Jaini Rais, Ramgarh Sardaran.

Vir Samvat 2440; —— *1914. A. D.*

Price with Binding 1/4/- } First Edition 1000. { One Shilling 8 Pence
" without " 1/- } { " " 4 "

THIS BOOK IS PUBLISHED BY A RESPECTIVE MAN TO THE MEMORY OF HIS BELOVED FATHER DIWAN KIRPA RAM SHIAB S. S. JAINI 'RAIS' RAMGARH SARDARAN, DIST. LUDHIANA & ITS SELLING PROCEEDS WILL GO TO JAIN RELIGIOUS WORKS.

Printed by

MOHAMED ABDULLAH & CO.,

AT THE

UNION PRINTING WORKS,

LUDHIANA.

1914.

Please Turn Over

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

I DEEM IT necessary bring to the notice of the Public in General, and all Jain Brothern in particular, that "the UNION PRINTING WORKS LUDHIANA," undertakes to execute printing Orders with great care, and that the work done is neat, beautiful and legible free from all printing blunders. I was in look out for such a press, but I found it in Ludhiana to the best of my satisfaction.

With cordial and earnest desire and encouragement, I recommend the press, solicit the favour of the public to help the press with their orders of printing.

Well-Wisher of the Public,

MESSRS. BIJA RAM JAINI,

General Merchant & Agent,

Chaura-Bazar, **LUDHIANA.**

NON-INJURY IS THE HIGHEST RELIGION.

NON-INJURY MEANS THE CESSATION OF EVIL.



GOD IS NOT AS A CREATOR,

(KARTA-KHANDAN). BY THE SAME AUTHOR

(IN PREPARATION.)

This book can be had from:—

1. POPAT LALL, MOTI LALL SHAH,
Book-Sellers & Commission Agents,
Sarangpur. AHMEDABAD.

2. B. FATU RAM JAINI,
Joint Secretary,
S. S. Jain Sabha,
LUDHIANA.

3. L. NIHAL CHAND, DYAL CHAND JAINI,
General Book-Sellers,
JULLUNDHUR, (City).

4. MESSRS. BIJA RAM JAINI,
Chaura Bazar, LUDHIANA.

5 B. MELA RAM, SECRETARY,
S. S. Jain Sabha,
LUDHIANA.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.—MITHYA KHANDAN.

BOOK II.—THE ORIGIN OF JAINISM.

INTRODUCTION.

MY GURU SRI SWAMI UDE CHAND JI, who is a well-known preacher and a profound Scholor amongst the S. S. Jain community, has compiled this tract "Mithya-Khandan" in Urdu which I have translated into English, appending to this the origin of Jainism and explanations of some other religious points, because this Jainism has been most pitiably misunderstood. Its origin has been misconceived, its tenets have been misunderstood, its philosophy has been misconstrued, and its antiquity has been miscalculated. And in short it has been misunderstood wholesale. It has not only been misunderstood, but spitefully found fault with. People not only misunderstood it, but also cast slurs upon it out of spite, out of enmity, and out of bigottedness. Some have called it a Nastika religion. Some have called it a religion of the Banias and Shravagis. Some have regarded it as an off shoot of Budhism. Some have looked upon it as a religion that took its rise upon the revival of Brahminism under Shunkaracharya.

Some have regarded it as a product of Brahmanism. Some have called Mahâvira its founder. Some have called Parshvanath its originator. Some have looked upon it as a bundle of uncleanly habits. Some say that the Jains never bathe, nor they clean the teeth. They say "If an elephant comes to your face, no matter that it crushes you to death, but do not go before a Jain Sadhu (monk) to save yourself."

PREM CHAND, (LATE NAME
NANAK CHAND),
S. S. JAIN MUNI PUNJABEE.

PREFACE.

THIS translation of an Urdu treatise "Mithya-Khandan" has been rendered by Jain Muni SRI PREM CHAND JI, who has had religious turn of mind since boyhood and has ultimately become the disciple of Shri Swami Ude Chand Ji, Maharaj, a well-known preacher and a profound Scholar amongst the Swetambar Sthanak-Vasi Jain Community, to follow the path of virtue and Salvation laid down by Jain Tirthankaras. His motive to do so has been to place before the English knowing public the views in "Mithya-Khandan" dealing with answers to such questions as are raised against Jainism by the followers of other religions.

1. Are Jains allowed to bathe by their Shastras?

2. Do Jains kill a cow made of flour on the occasion of wedding?

3. Are Jains atheist?

4. Is charity forbidden by Jain Sutras?

5. Is it regarded as a sin to sink a well or construct a tank?

6. **When was Jainism started and by whom? Is Jainism an off—shoot of Budhism?**

The above mentioned points have been clearly explained, supported by Sutras and quotations from religious books. Members of other religions will find it a convincing tract.

The founder of Jainism was Shri Rishaba Dev Ji Maharaj who lived millions of years ago. He was succeeded one after another by 23 Tirthankars. The last two were Shri Parsva Nath and Sri Mahábíra Ji, of whom the great historians of the day speak as follows;—

1. Indian Wisdom by Monier Williams M.A. 1875, Page 129;—

"The last two Jinas, Parswa Nath and Mahavira, were probably real persons and are those principally revered by the Jains of the present day, the first founder of the sect, having been Parswa Nath and its first active propagator Mahavira."

2. History of India by Mahamahopadhayaya Hara Parshad Shastri, M. A. Page 16;-
"Mahavira does not appear to be the first preacher of Jainism. He seems to have reformed a pre-existing religion."

3. The Encyclopædia Britannica, 9th Edition Vol. XIII Page 543;-"The Jains count 24 prophets whom they call Jinas. This legend of 24 (Twenty-four) Jinas contains a germ of truth. Mahavira was not an originator; he merely carried on, with but slight changes, a system, which existed before his time and which probably owes its most distinguishing features to a teacher named, Parswa, who ranks in the succession of Jains as the predecessor of Mahāvīra."

This rendering into English is the first attempt on the part of the author, and if the readers find any blunder, they will kindly communicate it, for which the undersigned will be much obliged.

DHUMI RAM JAINI, B. A., S. A. V.,
Science Master, Govt. High School,
DELHI.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION

OF

MITHYA-KHANDAN.

ओं

नमोऽर्हत्सिद्धा चार्योपाध्याय-सर्वसाधुभ्यः

विद्यानिधिं तत्व नेष्टं जन सन्ताप हारिणं
समस्त ज्ञानो पेतं वन्दे जैनेश्वरं भुवि ॥ १ ॥

सच्छास्त्रोप देशेन जिज्ञासु वृन्द चेत सो
ध्वान्तंविनाशितं येन तं जिनं प्रणमाम्यहम् ॥ २ ॥

समस्त वस्तु विज्ञानं भूत ग्राम चराचरम्
ततं ये नात्र भवने तज्जिनं प्रणमाम्यहम् ॥ ३ ॥

श्लाग्यं ज्ञानवतां चैव जतीनां भावनात्मना
मुदयचन्द गुरू श्रेष्टं नमस्कृत्य करोम्यहम् ॥ ४ ॥

गुरो रूदय चन्दस्य गन्यु पाद्धि धारिणः
पादाववंलव्यमनीस विदद्ध मिथ्यार्थ खण्डनम् ॥ ५ ॥

रत्नचन्द इतिख्यातः भ्राता मे सर्व सम्मतः
तस्य मत्यनुसारेण प्रेमचन्दः करोम्यहम् ॥ ६ ॥

संसारार्णव मग्नानां प्राणिनांच हितायवै
इंगलिश गिरमाश्रित्य * तन्वे मिथ्यार्थ खण्डनम् ॥ ७ ॥

sionary discovers similarity between 'Jain' and 'Cain' of the Bible. Do not such writers mock history itself by their unwarranted and unsympathetic remarks? What a pity it is that they give great opinions without taking the least trouble of investigating the subject they write about! A historian can never explore the unknown regions of history and add anything to man's knowledge by such fruitless attempts at finding out resemblances between words which have nothing in common except similarity of sound. Moreover, religions have a halo of sanctity around them; so they ought not to be trifled with, as Jainism has been, by the above mentioned European scholars who have misunderstood both its antiquity and Philosophy.

JAINISM DID NOT ARISE IN THE 6th CENTURY A. D.

MR Whetney, W. D. writes in the Century Dictionary of the English language, London 1889, Part XI, page 3215;— "The Jain sect seems, according to their own scriptures, to have originated with one Parswanath about 700 B. C., but became fully established about 200 years later under Vardhmana (Jnatu-Putra.)"

2—Mr General Cunningham remarks in the Jour-

nal of The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britan and Ireland Volume IX of 1876, page 232;—"This is perhaps one of the most startling and important revelations, that has been made recent researches in India. It is true, that according to Jain books, their faith had continually flourished under a succession of teachers, from the death of Swami Mahavira in B. C. 527 down to the present time. Hitherto, however, there was no tangible evidence to vouch for the truth of this statement. But the Kankali mound at Mutura has now given us the most complete and satisfactory testimony, that the Jain religion ever before the beginning of Christian era, must have been in condition almost a rich and flourshing as that of Budhäism."

3—Mr Romesh Chandra Dutt C. I. E. writes in the History of ancient and modern of India, London 1906, page 37;—"There is evidence, that the Jains were wealthy and important community in many parts of India in the centuries proceeding the Christian era." After so much light having been thrown by some more sympathetic scholars who have left no stone unturned to study Jainism, no body can now side with Leth-

bridge and Mount Stuart Elphinstone and say that Jainism originated in 6th century A. D. Yet we regret that this opinion still lingers in some manuals and misleads young students.

JAINISM IS NOT A BRANCH OF BUDDHISM.

ONE more instance of lack of historical insight has been shown by Lassen, Weber and Hunter who propounded a wild and misleading theory which found, favour with a host of other Europeans scholars. The theory is that Jainism is an off shoot of Buddhism. Prof. Lassen and Weber describe the similarity between the two religions to be overwhelming. But the theory has been admirably criticised by Prof. Hermann Jacobi in his introductions to the volumes XXII and XLV of the sacred Books of the East Series. There the learned professor notices many points (which I will show further) of radical differences between the two religions which show that Lord Mahavira, the 24th Tirthankara or Prophet of the Jains, was a personage quite distinct from Gautama Buddha. Even, if, for argument's sake, we grant that the two religions are very similar as some scholars think, we can, from the

same premises, as logically, draw the conclusion that either Buddhism borrowed from Jainism or that there are some reasons to suppose that it is even an off shoot of Jainism. If there are similarities found in Jainism and Buddhism, we can account for them thus—that they being propagated in the same soil had the same atmosphere, the same surroundings and the same ideas.

Priority of Jainism over Buddhism.

COMPARING the out line of Mahavira's life with that of Buddha's Prof. Jacobi writes in his introduction to the Volume XXII of the sacred books of the East series ;—"The general resemblance between the lives of both is due to their being lives of ascetics, which from the nature of the things must present some uniformity, which certainly will appear greater to the mind of a European historian of our times than to that of an ancient Hindu.

Some names of Mâhâvira's relations are similar to those of Buddha's: the former's wife was Yasodâ, the latter's Yasodhara ; the former's elder brother was Nandivardhana, the latter's step brother Nanda ;

Buddha's name as a prince was Siddhârtha, which was the name of Mâhâvira's father. But if the similarity of these names proves anything, it proves no more than that names of this description were much used then among the Kshatriyas, as surely they were at all times.* Nor is it to be wondered at that two

Kshatriyas should have founded sects in opposition, or at least in disregard to the authority of the Brahaman.

We shall now put side by side the principal events of Buddha's and Mahavira's lives, in order to demonstrate their difference.

Buddha was born in Kapilavastu, Mahâvira in a village near Vaisâlï; Buddha's mother died after his birth, Màhávira's parents lived to see him a grown-up man; Buddha turned ascetic during the lifetime and against the will of his father, Mâhâvira did so after the death of his parents and with the consent of those in power; Buddha led a life of austerities for six years, Mâhâvira for twelve; Buddha thought these years wasted time, and that all his

*See *Petersburg Dictionory*, S. S. V. V.

penances were useless for attaining his end, Mahavira was convinced of the necessity of his penances,* and persevered in some of them even after becoming a Tirthankara.

Amongst Buddha's opponents Gosâla Makkhaliputra is by no means so prominent as amongst Mahavira's, nor among the former do we meet Jamâli, who caused the first schism in the Jaina church. All the disciples of Buddha bear other names than those of Mahavira. To finish this enumeration of differences, Buddha died in Kusinagara, whereas Mahavira died in Pâpâ, avowedly before the former."

Prof. Jacobi further proves the priority of Jainism to Buddhism by three distinct lines of evidence :—

* *These twelve years of penance were indeed always thought essential for obtaining perfection, and every ascetic who endeavours to quit this life with the best claims to enter one of the highest heavens, or even Nirvâna, has to undergo similar course of preparatory penance, which lasts twelve years.*

1st, It is now admitted by all that Nâtaputta (Gñât riputra), who is commonly called Mahavira or Vardhamâna, was a contemporary of Buddha; and that the Niganthas *(Nirgranthas), now better known under the name of Jainas or Arhatas, already existed as an important sect at the time when the Buddhist Church was being founded. But it is still open to doubt whether the religion of the early Nirgranthas was essentially the same as that taught in the canonical and other books of the present Jainas, or underwent a great change up to the time of the composition of the Siddhanta. In order to come nearer the solution of this question, it may be desirable to collect from the published Buddhist works, as the oldest witnesses we can summon, all available information about the Niganthas, their doctrines and religious practices.

* *Nigantha is apparently the orginal form of word, since it is thus spelled in the Asoka inscription, in Páli. and occasionally by the Jains, though the Phonetic laws of all three idioms would have given preference to the form Niggantha, the more frequent spelling in Gaina works,*

(a.) In the Anguttara Nikâya, III, 74, a learned prince of the Lichchavis of Vaisâli, Abhaya,* gives the following account of some Nigantha doctrines:—

"The Nigantha Nâtaputta, sir, who knows and sees all things, who claims perfect knowledge and faith (in the following terms): "walking and standing, sleeping or waking, I am always possessed of perfect knowledge and faith:" teaches the annihilation by austerities of the old Karman, and the prevention by in-

* *There are apparently two persons of this name. The other Abhaya, a son of King Srenika, was a patron of the Jainas, and is frequently mentioned in their legends and in the canonical books. In the Majjhima Nika 58 (Abhayakumârá Sutta) it is related that the Nigantha Nâtputta made him engage in a disputation with Buddha. The question was so adroitly framed that whether the answer was Yes or No, it involved Buddha in self-controdiction. But the plan did not succeed, and Abhaya was converted by Buddha.*

There is nothing in this account to elucidate the doctrines of Nâtaputta.

activity of new Karman. When Karman ceases, misery ceases; when misery ceases, perception ceases, when perception ceases, every misery will come to an end. In this way a man is saved by pure annihilation of sin (Nirjara) which is really effective."

The Jaina counterpart to these tents can be collected from Uttarâdhyayana XXIX. "By austerities he cuts off Karmas,"§ 27. 'By renouncing activity he obtains inactivity, by ceasing to act he acquires no new Karam, and destroys the Karman, he had acquired before' § 37. The last stages in this process are fully described in §§71, 72. And again, in XXXII, V. 7, we read: "Karman is the root of birth and death, and birth and death they call misery". The nearly indentical Verses 34, 47, 60, 73, 86. 99 may be thus condensed: 'But a man is indifferent to the object of the senses, and to to the feelings of the mind (this comes nearest to the Buddhist Vedana, perception,) is free from sorrows; though still in the Sansara, he is not afflicted by that long succession of pains, just as the leaf of the Lotus (is not moistened)

by water'. The above assertion that Nâtaputta claimed the possession of perfect knowledge and faith, requires no further proof; for it is one of the fundamental dogmas of the Jains.

(b.) Another piece of information about Nigantha doctrines may be gathered from the Mahavagga VI, 31 (S, B. E, Vol. XVII, P. 108ff.) There a story is told of Siha,* the general of the Lichchavis, who was a lay-disciple of Nataputta. He wanted to pay the Buddha a visit, but Nataputta tried to dissuade him from it, because the Niganthas held the Kriyâvâda, while the Buddha taught the Akriyavada. Siha, however, setting his master's prohibition at nought, went to the Buddha on his own account, and was, of course, converted by him. Now the statement that the Niganthas embraced the Kriyavada is borne out by our texts; for in

**The name Siha occurs in the Bhagvati (Calcutta edition, P. 1267, see Hoernle, Uvâsaga Dasâo Appendix, P. 10) as that of a disciple of Mâhavira: but as he was a monk, he can not be identified with his name sake in the Mahâvagga.*

the Sutrakritanga I. 12, 21, below, P. 319, it is said that a perfect ascetic 'is entitled to expound the Kriyavada;' and this doctrine is thus expressed in the Achâranga Sutra I, I, I, 4 (Part i, P. 2): 'He believes in soul, believes in the world, believes in reward, believes in action (believed to be our own doing in such judgement as these): "I did it;" "I shall cause another to do it;" "I shall allow another to do it.",

(c.) Another lay disciple of Mahâvîra, converted by the Buddha, was Upali. As narrated in the Majjhima Nikaya 56, he ventured upon a dispute with him whether the sins of the mind are heaviest, as the Buddha teaches, or the sins of the body, as the Nigantha Nataputta contents. In the beginning of the discourse Upali states that his master uses the term *danda*, punishment, for what is commonly called Kamma, deed, act. This is true, though not quite to the letter; for the word Kamma occurs also in the Jaina-Sutras in that sense. The term *danda*, however, is at least as frequently used. Thus, in the Sutrakritanga II, 2, P. 357 ff., the thirteen kinds of 'committing

sins' are treated of, and in the first five cases the word which I have translated 'committing sins' is in the original *danda*-Samâdâne, दण्ड समादान and in the remaining cases Kiriyâthâne i. e. Kiryâsthâna, क्रिया स्थान.

The Nigantha *Upali* goes on to explain that there are three *dandas*, the *danda* of body, that of speech, and that of mind. This agrees with the Jaina doctrine expressed in nearly the same words in the Sthananga sutra, 3rd Uddesaka (see Indian Antiquary, IX, P. 159.)

The second statement of Upali, that the Niganthas consider sins of the body more important than sins of the mind, is in perfect harmony with Jaina views. For in the Sutrakritanga II, 4, P. 398, ff., the question is discussed whether sins may be committed unconsciously, and it is boldly answered in the affirmative (compare Note 6, P. 399); and in the sixth Lecture of the same book (P. 414) the Buddhists are severely ridiculed for maintaining that it depends on the intention of the man whether a deed of his be a sin or not.

(d.) In the Añguttara Nîkâya III; 70, 3, some practices of Nigantha laymen are discussed. I translate the passage thus: "O Visakhâ, there is a class of Samanas who are called Niganthas. They exhort a Savaka thus: "Well, sir, you must desist from doing injury to beings in the East beyond a yojana from here, or to those in the West, North, South, always beyond a Yojana from here." In this way they enjoin tenderness by making him spare some living beings, in this way they enjoin cruelty by making him not spare other living beings." It is not difficult to recognise under these words the Digvirati vow of the Jainas, which consists in laying down the limits beyond which one shall not travel nor do business in the different directions. A man who keeps this vow can not, of course, do any harm to beings beyond the limits within which he is obliged to keep. This is so distorted by the hostile sect as to lay the rule under discussion open to blame, we can not expect one sect to give a fair and honest exposition of the tents of their opponents; it is but natural that they

should put them in such a form as to make the objections to be raised against them all the better applicable. The Jains were not a whit better in this respect than the Buddhas, and they have retorted upon them in the same way; witness their misrepresentation of the Buddhist idea that a deed becomes a sin only through the sinful intention of the doer, in a passage in the XLV volume, P. 414, V, 26 ff, where the sound principle of the Buddhists is ridiculed by applying it to a fictitious and almost obsured case. The passage in the Anguttara Nikaya, which we have just discussed, goes on as follows:—On the Uposatta day they exhort a Savaka thus: "Well, sir, take off all your cloths and declare: I belong to no body, and no body belongs to me." Now his parents know him to be their son, and he knows them to be his parents. His son or wife know him to be their father or husband, and he knows them to be his son or wife. His slaves and servants know him to be their master, and he knows them to be his slaves and servants. Therefore (the Niganthas) make him use lying speech at

the time when he makes the above declarations. On this account I charge him with lying speech. After the lapse of that night he enjoys pleasures (by means of things) that were not freely given on this account. I charge him with taking of what is not freely given.' According to this statement, the duties of a Nigantha layman became, during the Uposatha days, equal to those of a monk; it was on common days only that the difference between layman and monk was realised. This description, however, does not quite agree with the Posaha rules of the Jainas. Bhandarkar gives the following definition of Posaha according to the Tattvârtha-Sâradîpikâ, which agrees with what we know about it from other sources: "Posaha, i. e. to observe a fast or eat once only or one dish only on the two holidays (the eighth and the fourteenth of each fortnight.), after having given up bathing, unquents, ornaments, company of women, odours, incense, lights, etc., and assumed renunciation as an ornament." Though the Posaha observances of the present Jains are apparently more severe than those of the

Buddhists, still they fall short of the above description of the Nigantha rules; for a Jaina layman does not, to my knowledge, take off his clothes during the Posaha days, though he discards all ornaments and every kind of luxury; nor must he pronounce any formula of renunciation similar to that which the monks utter on entering the order. Therefore, unless the Buddhist account contains some mistake or a gross misstatement, it would appear, that the Jainas have abated somewhat in their rigidity with regard to the duties of laymen.

(e.) Buddha Ghosa, in his commentary on the Brahmajala Sutta, Digha-Nikaya I, 2, 38, *mentions the Niganthas as holding the opinions, discussed in the text, that the soul has no colour, in contradistinction to the Ajivikas, who divide mankind into six clases according to the colour of the Atman; both Niganthas and Ajivikas, however, agree in maintaining that the soul continues to exist after death and is free from ailments (arôgô). Whatever may

*Samangala Vilâsinî, P. 119 of the Pali text society edition.

be the exact meaning of the last expression, it is clear, that the above description squares with the opinion of the Jains about the nature of the soul.

(*f.*) In another passage (I. C. P. 168) Buddhaghosa says that Nigathas Nataputta, considers cold water to be possessed of life (so kira sitodake Sattasaññi hôti), for which reason he does not use it. This doctrine of the Jainas is so generally known that I need not bring forward any quotation from the sutras in support of its genuineness.

(*g.*) The passage occurs in the Samaññaphala sutta of the Digha Nikaya.* I translate it in accordance with Buddhoghosa's comment in the Sumangala Vilasini. 'Here, great king, a Nigantha is protected by restraint in four directions (Chatuyama—samvara-samvuto)—चतुयम संवर संवुतो How, great king, is a Nigantha protected hy restraint in fcur directions? Here, great King, a Nigantha abstains from all(cold) water, he abstains from all bad deeds,

**Page 57 of the edition in the Pali Text Society.*

by abstinence from all bad deeds he is free from sins, he realises abstinence from all bad deeds. In this way, great king, a Nigantha is protected by restraint in four directions. And, great king, because he is thus protected, the Nigantha Nataputta's soul is exalted, is restrained, is well settled.'†—This is, certainly, not an accurate nor an exhaustive description of the Jain acreed, though it contains nothing alien from it, and successfully imitates the language of the Jaina sutras. As I have already explained elsewhere,‡ I think the term(Chatuyama-samvarasamvutô) has been misunderstood not only by the commentator, but also by the author of the text. For the Pali Chatuyama is equivalent to the Prakrit,-प्राकृत Châtujjâma,-चउज्जाम, a well-

† *The translations of Gogerly and of Burnouf in Grimblot, sept Suttas Pâlis, were made without the help of a commentary, and may, therefore be passed by. It is however, open to doubt whether Buddha ghôsa has drawn his information from Genuine tradition, or had to rely on conjectures of his own.*

‡ *See my paper, 'on Mahavira and his predecessors,' in the Indian Antiquary, IX, 158 ff., where some of the above problems have been treated.*

known Jaina term which denotes the four vows of Parsva in contradistinction to the five vows (Pañchamahavvaya)—पंच महाव्वया of Mahavira. Here, then, the Buddhists, I suppose, have made a mistake in ascribing to Nâtaputta Mahavira a doctrine which properly belonged to his predecessor Parsva. This is a significant mistake; for the Buddhists could not have used the above term as descriptive of the Nigantha creed unless they had heard it from followers of Parsva, and they would not have used it if the reforms of Mahavira had already been generally adopted by the Niganthas at the time of Buddha. I therefore, look on this blunder of the Buddhists as a proof for the correctness of the Jaina tradition, that followers of Parsva actually existed at the time of Mahavira.

(*h.*) I show another significant blunder of the Buddhists: they call Nâtaputta an Aggivêsana; अग्गिवेसन,*i. e.* Agnivaisyâyana; according to the Jainas, however, he was a Kâsyapa, and we may credit them in such particulars about their own Tirthankara. But Sudharman, his chief

disciple, who in the Sutras is made the expounder of his creed, was an Agnivaisyâyana, and as he played a prominent part in the propagation of the Jaina religion, the disciple may often have been confounded by outsiders with the master, so that the Gotra of the former was erroneously assigned to the latter. Thus by a double blunder the Buddhists attest the existence of Mahavira's predecessor Parsva and of his chief disciple Sudharman.

2nd, Some indirect proofs:—

(*a.*) The records in the Buddhist canon are not repugnant to our views about the existence of the Niganthas before Nâtpûtta; for the Niganthas must have been an important sect at the time when Buddhism took its rise. This may be inferred from the fact that they are so frequently mentioned in the Pitakas as opponents or converts of Buddha and his disciples; and as it is nowhere said or even merely implied that the Niganthas were a newly founded sect, we may conclude that they had already existed a considerable time before the advent of the Buddha.

(*b.*) Mankkhali Gôsala, a contemporary of Buddha and Mahavira, divided mankind into six classes.* Of these, according to Buddhaghosa,† the third class contains the Niganthas. Gosala probably would not have ranked them as a separate, *i.e.* fundamental sub-division of mankind, if they had only recently come into existence. He must have looked upon them as a very important, and at the same time, an old sect, in the same way in which, in my opinion, the early Buddhists looked upon them.

(*c.*) As a last argument in favour of my theory I may mention that in the Majjhima Nikaya 35, a disputation between the Buddha and Sachchaka, the son of a Nigantha, is narrated. Sachchaka is not a Nigantha himself, as he boasts of

**Sàmànnaphala Sutta, Digha Nikaya 11,20.*

†Sumangala Vilásiní, P. 162. Buddhaghosa expressly states that Gosala reckoned the Niganthas lower than his own lay disciples, who form the fourth class.—As Buddhaghosa does not take umbrage at Gôsâla's reckoning the Bhikkhus still lower, it is clear that he did not identify the Bhikkus with the Buddhist monks.

having vanquished Nátaputta in disputation,* and, moreover, the tents he defends are not those of the Jainas. Now when a famous controversialist, whose father was a Nigantha, was a contemporary of the Buddha, the Niganthas can scarcely have been a sect founded during Buddha's life.

3rd, Evidence of the Jain Book themselves:-

THESE books can never be a tissue of meaningless lies as some biassed writers suppose. The event and incidents their related in a matter of fact way as remarked by Prof. Jacobi, should not be distrusted unless under the force of very strong arguments. In the Uttaradhayayan, Lecture XXIII, is mentioned an interview, near Sravasti,—सावसति between Gautama Indrabhuti, a disciple of Lord Mahavira and Kesi, a follower of Lord Parswa Nath in which after a good conversation as to the number of vows and use or disuse of clothes, the two leaders recognised that the doctrines of their respective teachers were essentially the same. This points out that an older faith prevailed before the advent of Lord Mahavira who re-

See page 250 of the Pali Text Society edition.

organised the same faith on a firmer basis. Prof. Jacobi thus expodes once and for ever the theory that Jainism is an off shoot of Buddhism. Many other examples are given below, which go to prove, that Jainism is not an off shoot of Buddhism:—

1. The new Volume of the Encyclopoedia Britannica XXIX, the tenth edition, page 662:—"It is now certain, that the Jaina community was really even older than the time of the Buddha, and was reorganised by his contemporary the Swami Mahavira, named Vardhaman."

2. Third annual report of the *S. S. Jain conference Ajmeer, page 6. H. H. The Gaekwar of Broada, writes:—"It was believed for centuries by all out-siders that Jainism was an off shoot of Buddhism and its study was neglected on account of this belief. And who dispelled this misunderstanding? Not the members of your community! A German scholar was required to announce of the world, that Jainism was independent of Buddhism and was able to prove that your 23rd Tirthankara was not a mythological personage and that he lived as early as 700 B. C."

3. A New Geography of the Indian Empire

† *The S. S. mean Swetamber Sthanakvasi,*

and Ceylon by Cameron-Marrison, M. A. L. L. D. 1909, page 218: "Jainism is not as has been supposed, an off shoot of Buddhism, but is quite an ancient faith."

4. A brief History of the Indian peoples by Sir William Wilson Hunter K. C. S. I., C. I. E., M. A. Oxon L. L. D. Cambridge 1903, page 83:—"The Jains of India are usually merchants or bankers. Their charity is boundless and they form the chief supporters of the beast hospitals. They claim, not without evidence, that the Jain religion is even older than Buddhism and that the teaching of Buddha was based on the Jain faith."

5. The religons of world by John Murdoch, L. L. D. 1902, page 127: "Jainism very much resembles Buddhism. Jainism was probably the earlier out growth. It was probably founded by Parsvanath, about 200 years before Buddha and merely reformed by Mahavira, the contemporary of Buddha"

6. The religions of India by Edward Washburn Hapkins P. hd. (Leipsic) 1895, page 288:—

"The Jain is more particular in his respect for life than in Bnddhist. Least animate things, even plants and anima lcule, be destroyed, he sweeps the ground

before him, as he goes, walks, veiled lest, he inhale a living organism."

7. A short primer of the Indian History by M. Prothers, M. A. 1907, page 27;—"Jainism originated a little before Buddhism, the derivation of the word "Jain" is from "Jina"=a conquering saint, one who has conquered self and desire."

Evidence of Hindu Shastras. I may add one more line of evidence to these remarks. It is this that there are separate references to the two religions in the Hindu Shastras which go to prove that Jainism was not product of Buddhism. The Puranas speak of those religions as totally different from each other. Again Madhava in his Sankar Digvijaya, mentions that Sankar held debates with Jains at Ujjain and also with Buddhists at Benares. If the Jain religion was the out come of Buddhism, there was no need of this double trouble.

Many other examples can be cited more, but the foregoing arguments are quite sufficient to show that Jainism did not arise from Buddhism *i.e.* within the last 2500 years and this falsifies the opinion of many European Scholars including W. J. Wilkins

who says in his 'Modern Hindnism' that Jainism is of later origin than Buddhism. Now this remark is a self contradiction; for, he admits that the 23rd and 24th Tirthankaras are historical personages. Now as Mahavira was the contemporary of Buddha, Parsvanath, his predecessor, no doubt must have flourished earlier than Buddha. Notwithstanding this, Wilkins still says that Jainism is of later date than Buddhism!!!

PARSHVA NATH WAS NOT THE FOUNDER OF JAINISM BUT RISHABHA DEVA.

LET us now see if Jainism was founded by Parshva Nath. Let us now see if Parshva Nath is spoken of as the founder of Jainism in any of the Buddhist, the Jain or the Hindu scriptures.

Buddhists works. The Buddhists Texts are silent on the point and this was to be expected because Buddhism was started only in the days of the last Tirthankara, Mahavira. In Buddist scriptures there is mention only of Mahavira at the head of the Nigranthas. Mahavira is not mentioned therein as the originator of the Nigranthas creed but simply as

the leader of the Nigranthas so far as Prof. Jacobi has been able to ascertain.

Jain Shastras. Jain Sidhant shows that the tenets of Jain Dharma were laid down by Swami Rishibha Deva.

He was succeeded by 23 other Tirthankaras who preached and supported His words. This world is eternal but there has ever been a cycle of two periods in this Bhârat Khetara and will continue to be so. Just as night follows day and *vice versa.* Similarly Sarpinikâla follows Utsarpini Kâla and Utsarpini Kâla follows Sarpini Kâla, the duration, of which is 10 Korâ Korâ of oceans of years. The whole wheel of time contains twenty Kôrâ Kôrâ (crores mutiplied by crores) oceans* of years. Each of these kâlas consists of six Arâs. As the followers of Vedic religion have divided kâla into four parts—(1) Satyuga. (2.) Trêta. (3.) Dwaûar. (4.) Kalu सतयुग १ त्रेता २ द्वापर ३ कलु ४, so in Jainism six parts of Kâla are;—Sûkhama-Sûkhama, Sûkhama, Sûkhama-dûkhama, Dukhama-Sûkhama, Dukhama, & Dukhama-dukhama.

** The numbers of years in one ocean is given in Jain Sutras.*

In short, just as a year's division are (1) Utarâin,-उत्तरायण (2) Dakhshnâin—दक्षणायन and each is made of six months, so the Sarpini and Utsarpini Kalas are sub-divided into six Aras. In Sarpini Kala age and size gradually decreased, and reaching a limit again begin to increase in Utsarpini Kala. It resembles to changes in a year of 12 months, during which for six months the day waxes and for other six months the day wanes. At present the fifth Ara of Sarpini Kala is rolling on which is equal to 21000 years. The account of the first Ara is thus given in the Jambo dip-pargapti:—At that time Bharat Khanda was a beautiful country. There was neither a mountain, nor any hillock, nor any hollow. There was neither hot nor cold weather. It was free from all troubles. No trade was carried on, no loss was incurred. No unseasonal rain or wind came off. The people of those days were called yugalins. There were no rituals or ceremonies. They were kind by nature. They were neither too much pathetic or unpathetic. There were no towns, villages or buildings. The yugalins lived under trees called Kalpa-Brikhshas, which supplied all their wants. They were gigantic in strature and very strong. They

lived a life of crores of years. But in that golden period the yuglins lived happily and were very few in numbers. Corn grew a little, but it was not used by them, because Kalpa-Brikhshas provided all their wants. Afterwards on account of revolution of time during the next two Aras, all good things were reduced. Number of men was increased and their strength and age decreased. Kalpa Brikhshas became less and less and the fruits they bore were less. This increased their enmity, jealousy, grudge, and the necessity of a governor to rule over them arose. So a Kulakarin dynasty was formed to make laws and administer justice. The first of the dynasty was Vimalvahana and the last was Nabhi. During the reign of the first five Kulakars the punishment for an offence was simply to say to the offender "Oh you did it." And these very words 'Hakar'—हकार were enough to make him feel to the core of his heart. But as time passed on and the 'Hakar' form of Government had lost its force, another punishment, *i. e.* 'Makar-'मकार was prescribed during the next five. It meant that if any one guilty of an offence and would not give up his bad habit, after he had undergone 'Hakar danda' he was punished with "Makar-danda"

It meant, "don't do so." This kind of punishment was regarded by him as a capital punishment. When "Makara-danda" proved proved unless, another kind of punishment was brought into force in the time of last five Kulakars.

It was "Dhikkâra danda,-धिक्कार" If a culprit felt no remorse under the first two forms of punishment, he was to undergo "Dhikkara danda," *i.e.* "Shame (fie) on you who would act so badly."

When after some period these forms of punishment failed to produce any result and the yuglia religon began to disappear from this Khetar (region) then Rishibha Deva, Arhat, came from 26th Devaloka (Sarvarthasidha) into the womb of Maru Devi on the 4th Ashada, dark (fortnight), at midnight, and was born on the 8th Chaitra, dark (fortnight).

He was called Rishibha Deva, because his mother who dreamt 14 dreams as usual, saw a bullock in her first dream. He also had had the form of an bullock on his feet, so he was named Rishibha Deva. When Rishibha Deva was a child. Indra Maharaj (King of deities) came to see him.

Thinking that Bhagwan was still a child and is not a Sadhu (monk), he deemed it proper to take with

This Rishabha in the Bhagvata is said to be the founder of Jainism. And see when Rishabha was born. In the beginning of the world when Brahma created Swayambhu Manu and Satya Rupa. He was fifth in descent from them. He lived by the end of the first Kritayuga and twenty-eight Krityugas कृतयुग are to pass in this Manvantara. This Rishabha preached Jainism. In Shlokas 9-11 of the sixth Adhayaya, the author of the Bhagavata speaks of one Arhat, a Raja of Konka, Venka, and Nata, who, he says hearing of the Charita of Rishabha from his countrymon, would start in Kaliyuga a religion the followers of which would hate the Brahamans and go to hell.

यस्य किलानुचरित मा श्र मातीत सुपाकरर्य कोंक वेंक कुटकानां राजा ईम्रामो पशिक्षय कलाष धर्म उत्कृष्य मारो भवितव्येन विमोहित: स्वधर्म्म पथम कुतोभय मय हाय कुपथया स्वरण्डम समंजसं निज मनीषया मन्द: सम्प्रवर्त्तयिष्यते ॥ ९ ॥

ये महवाव कलौ मनुजाप सदा देव माया मोहिताः स्वविधि नियोग शौच चारित्र विहीना देव हेलनान्य पव्रतानि निज निजेच्छ्या गृण्, हाना अस्नाना ना चमना शौच के शोल्लुं वनार्दीनि कलिनाऽधर्म वहुलेनो पहताधियो ब्रह्म ब्राह्मण यज्ञ पुरूष लोक विदूषका: प्रायण भविष्यन्ति ॥ १० ॥

ते च ह्यर्वाक्त नया निज लोक यात्रयान्ध परम्परया श्वस्तास्त मस्यन्धे स्वयमेव प्रपतिष्यन्ति ॥ ११ ॥

पंचम स्कन्ध अ० ॥ ६ ॥

No such Raja has ever lived, nor in any other Brahmanical writing where the word Arhat occurs is he spoken of as a Raja of Konka, Venka, and Nata, so far as I have been able to ascertain. Arhat means praiseworthy if the word be derived from Arh to praise; or it means killer of the enemies, if the word be Arihanta. This word occurs in Shiva Purana. There was no such Raja as Arhat. Rishibha himself was Arhat or Arihanata. He was praiseworthy and killer of the enemies, the Karmans. If Arhat preached Jainism in Kaliyuga, why is Rishabha called a Jin-deva in Vachaspatya and Adi-Jindeva in Shabdartha Chintamani. I am told in some Upanishads Rishabha is called Arhat. There was no such Raja as Arhat. Rishabha himself was Arhat. It is owing to mutual jealousy that the author of the Bhagavata makes Arhat copy the Charita of Rishabha and starts Jainism in Kaliyuga. Perhaps he did not like to give Jainism an earlier antiquity. But even if according to him the charitra of Rishabha was copied, it was that charitra upon which Jainism was

WHEN DO WE BEGIN?

NOW we have to discuss as to our beginning and as to the time assigned to our rise by our other sects. From Sri Mahabira Ji who was the 24th Tirthankara to the day, we give our pure Pattavali (पट्टावली) in evidence. Let every one who may, read it. Notwithstanding this, some declare that we are 400 years old, others say 300 years or 250 years or 150 years old which of them is correct?

I say, none. For each of them put down, at random, without any proof in hand. They would not distinguish between right and wrong.

Now I take one of their own references and wish you to weigh it. They say Dhundia rose in 1531, Vikram era. But it is given in their own authentic Kalpa Sutra that the influence of the great Graha called Kshudrâtuma, resembling a heep of ashes, on the natal asterism of the Venerable Ascetic Mahavira, would be to the effect that there would be no progress of Jain Shâshan for two thousand years, but the advancement of these Swetambris who worship the images of Tirthankaras came off during this

epoch; in other words, all Swetambri Acharyas and commentators, etc, whom they rely upon and from whose Granthas (books) they quote references, flourished in that period, which was marked by the decline of Jainism. Most important and well-known temples were constructed as well. When the influence of the Star (graha) ceased at the expiration of two thousand years, then and then alone according to their writings, Dhundia rose in power and 45 men of distinguished family became disciple of Muni Gian Ji 'ज्ञान जमिहाराज and extended the sphere of influence of Sthanak-wasi (Dhundia).

With these facts in view, we are regarded of recent origin and they of old standing a good conclusion drawn!!!

Along with it I would like to draw the attention of Digambri brothern to the fact, that if they desire to maintain union between different sects and aim at the advancement of Jainism, they should ever be righteous in views and pure of heart and never indulge in such policy and follow such lines of conduct as are taken advantage of by B. Banarsi Das, M. A. in his lecture of 1901 delivered at Muthra and B. Nâthu Ram Premi in the foot note of a lec-

ture by R. R. Vasu Deva Govind, oppote B. A. Indore Navasi. There are remarks in them against our sect (Dhundia.)

Possibly they could not answer objections raised by men of other creeds, and regarding their false imputations to Jainism as true ascribed them all to Swetambara Sthankwasi and thus attempted to make Swetambara Sthanakwasi (Dhundia) sect a finger point for all so-called ill-founded defects in Jainism and thereby trampled down righteousness to save themselves. They say that they bathe and drink water cold and filtered through cloth.

But it is the Dhundia monks who do contrary to that. It is they who have been the cause of all the so-called blemishes and weak points to be urged by other religionists in Jainism. To be brief all humiliation and down-fall to Jain religion is due to Dhundia.

On the one hand they quote references from Vedas, Mahâbhârata etc., which teach against Jainism, to prove the antiquity of Jain religion, and on the other hand they try to establish that Dhundias are 250 years standing. Woe to such literary prudence and intellect! Supposing, Dhundia

monks drink distilled (phrâsuka) water and do not bathe, one may question; "Do Digambri monks (Muna Mahâraj) drink cold (undistilled—कच्चा) water and bathe?" If they are said to do so, then which is their Jalla (dirt) *parisaha* (trouble) out of twenty-two *Parishas* (troubles), and what are their Mahâ britas (great vows)?

WHY AND WHEN WE WERE CALLED DHUNDIAS?

THEY say that they lived in ruined houses, in Gujerat, Kathiawar and so they began to be called Dhundias. No matter if they gave vent to their views with any underlying motive whatever. But taking their wrong assertion to be true, it remains to be decided if it is a slur to live in lonely and crumbling houses, for which they seem to taint Sthanakwasi.

For a Sadhau to live in such a place is a matter of pride but not of disgrace The more a sadhu retires to solitude, the moie he can plunge himself in meditation.

Then how can it be dis-honourable? However, if it is regarded disrespectful, Vide Sri Achârainga-

Sutra, Book I, Lecture 9, Lessen 2, V. 2, 3:—

"आवेसण सभापवासु पणियसालासुएगदावासो
अदुवाय लिय ठाणेसु पलाल पुंजे सुएगदा वासो ॥२॥
आगंतारे आराम गारे तह नगर विएग दा वासो
सुसाणे सुन्नागारेसु रुख मूले विएगदावासो॥ ३ ॥"
(श्रीआचारंग सूत्र स्कन्ध १ अध्यैन ६ उदेशा २
गाथा (श्लोक) २ वा ३ ॥

E.T.—"He sometimes lodged in workshops, assembling places, wells, or shops; sometimes in manufactories or under a shed of straw" (2)

"He sometimes lodged in traveller's halls, garden-houses, or towns; sometimes on a burying-ground, in relinquished houses, or at the foot of a tree". (3)

Was Sri Mahâbira Swami a Dhundia, for, this appetation is also applicable to Him. In this case, we are proud of this name. Here is another reference to be noted in Sri Uttarâdhayayana Sutra, Lecture 2, V 20.

"सुसाणे सुन्नागारे वा रुख मूलेव एगउ
अकु कूउ निसी एजा नय वित्तासए परं ॥ २० ॥"
श्रीउत्तराध्ययन सूत्र, अध्ययन २, गाथा (श्लोका)॥ २०॥

E. T. "In a burial-place, or a deserted house, or below a tree he should sit down, alone, without moving, and he should not derive away any one." (20)

How do you dare assert that Sthanakwasis began to be called with the contemptuous name Dhundia on account of their taking abode in ruined and bad houses.

If I am asked to explain why Sthanakwasi are called Dhundias, I will say this much in brief.

On account of that Graha, called Kshudarâtma, most of the Jains gave up pure Dharma (religion) and embraced idol-worship. They became the bitter enemy of those who persuaded them not to do so. At that time there were only a few Sadhus who had remained to the right belief (Jainism). Whenever other Jains required their help in settling any discussion or problem of religion, they always found them, after a good research, engaged in Samâdhi (deep meditation) in lonely places. Those lay—votaries told them that they had arrived at the conclusion of their enquiry after undergoing an arduous task of a search. They perverted their words and made the Sadhus known by the nickname of Dhundias, by which is still the monkhood designated.

Q. Do you not believe in idol-worship?

A. Yes. I regard an idol as an idol but do not exalt it to the dignity of God.

Q. When it is set up in a temple as Bhagwân and adorned as God, why do you object to consent to that?

A. Can an im-real thing be real by mere supposition? If it is urged that it can be so, then a thing may be supposed what it is not, by any body at will. He has merely to make a supposition and to trouble himself for nothing else.

Sand may be regarded sugar, salt pure sugar, a piece of twig resembling sugar cane, a sugar cane and brass as gold and glass as diamond, and a counterfeited rupee, a real rupee. Would you like to take these supposed things in place of real ones. Can they be used in place of real ones. If you say, no. I say why not?

Q. These things are evidently full of defects; but it (idol) has none.?

A. Well, sir, it is a good explanation!

On the one hand the existence of the properties of other things are not assumed, but in the

other, the inherent virtues of another being are declared to exist. What does this imply?

Nothing but ignorance and obstinacy. If you say "We don't regard the idol as Bhagwan;" I further question, what you then think it and with what belief you worship them. If you say in reply, "We do adoration."

Whom do you adore? Do you adore Bhagwân or stone—One who has renounced (Tyagi-त्यागी) or one who enjoys (Bhogi-भोगी) the world? Is it permissible to place before a "Tyagi" things which he vowed never to indulge in? If it is said, no, it is not permissible. Well, was not Bhagwan 'Tyagi,' before whom flowers and fruits are offered?

To so is a matter of great regret. A young Sravika (श्राविक) boy would not use vegetable etc, on certain days तिथियां *e.g.*, 2nd—दूज, 5th—पंचमी, 8th—अष्टमी, 11th—एकादशी and 14th—चतुर्दशी etc. Is Bhagwan so far fallen down in his vows that he cannot give up the use of those things on the above mentioned days? Again if it is urged that it is not he

who desires it, but it is the manifestation of our earnest devotion to him. Thereupon, I would ask "Why is it necessary to adore and worship him in such an objectionable useless way which leads to the violation of His vows?" Is it not a true devotional attitude to obey His order?

If such a devotion is right, why should they not resort to it in the case of their Gurus who have renounced such things. They should adopt such devotion.

When there is no sin or injury in doing so, it is not a matter to fear. *If this view is advanced* that all this is merely to keep afresh their memory, then why do they declare forcibly that salvation lies in Puja, Prakshalna पूजा प्रज्ञालन? Better see what all Tirthankaras say to all Sadhus (monks) and Sravakas (lay-votaries.):—

" जेय अतीता जेय पडिपुन्ना जेय आगमिस्सा अरिहन्ता भगवन्तो ते सव्वे गव माइ खन्ति एवं भासन्ति एवं पन्नवन्ति एवं परूवन्ति सव्वे पाणा सव्वे भूया

सव्वे जीवा सव्वे सत्ता न हन्तव्वा न अज्झावेतव्वा न परिघेतव्वा न परितावे यव्वा न किलामे यव्वा न उद्दवे यव्वा एस धम्मे सुद्धे णितिये सासय सम्मेच्च लोयं खेयन्नेहिं पवेदिते तंजहा

उठिये सुवा अणुठिये सुवा उवुठिये सुवा अणुवठिये सुवा उवरय दंडे सुवा उणुव रय दंडे सुवा सोवहिए सुवा अणुवुहिये सुवा संजोगरए सुवा असंजोग रए सुवा तच्चं चेयं तहा चेयं अस्सिं चेयं पुवुच्चति "

श्री आचारंग सूत्र स्कन्ध १ अध्ययन ४ उदेशा १

E. T. "The Arhats and Bhagavats of the past, present, and future, all say thus, speak thus, declare thus, explain thus: all breathing, existing, living, sentient creatures* should not be slain, nor treated with

1. **Sabbe Pánà mean all beings with two organs of sence, beings with three organs of sense, and beings with four organs of sense.*

2. Sabbe Bhuyá mean all vegetable (vinâspati) beings.

3. Sabbe Jiva mean all beings with five organs of sense containing men and animals.

4. Sabbe Satta mean earth beings, water beings, fire beings and wind beings.

violence, nor abused, nor tormented, nor driven away. This is the pure, unchangeable, eternal law, which the clever ones, who understand the world, have declared: among the zealous and the not zealous, among the faithful and the not faithful, among the not cruel and the cruel, among those who have wordly weakness and those who have not, among those who like social bonds and those who do not: 'that is the truth, that is so, that is proclaimed in this (creed).",

(Vide Sri Achâranga Sutra, Book I, Lecture 4th, Lesson I.)

It is not confined to this much. They who assert that there is no sin in doing what is done for Dharma, are explicitly and threateningly given warnings in Sutra Acharanga, Book I, Lecture 4, Lesson 2;—

" आवन्ति के आवन्ति लोगंसि समणाय माहाणाय पुडो विबादं बदंति से दिठं च णे सुयं च णे मयं च णे विणायं च णे उठं अहं तिरियं दिसासु सव्वतो सुपडिले हियं च णे सव्वे पाणा सव्वे भुया सव्वे जीवा सव्वे सत्ता हन्तव्वा अज्ञावेयव्वा परितावेयव्या किलामेयव्वा परिघे तव्वा उद्द्वे यव्वा एथंपि जाणह न त्थित्थ दो सो

अणारिये वयण मेयं तत्थ जेते आयरिया ते एवं वयासी से दुदिठंच मे दुसुयंच मे दुमयंच मे दुविन्नायंच मे उठं अहं तिरियं दिसासु सव्वतो दुपाडिलेहियंच मे जंनं तुम्भे एव माई खह एवं भासह एवं पन्नवेह एवं परूवेह सव्वे पाणा सव्वे भुया सव्वे जीवा सव्वे सत्ता हन्तव्वा अभ्भावियव्वा परितावे यव्वा परिघे तव्वा किलामे यव्वा उद्दवे यव्वा एयं पिजाणह नत्थित्थ दोसो

अणारिये वयण मेयं

वयं पुण एवं माई खामों एवं भासा मों एवं परू वामो एवं सव्वे पाणा सव्वे भुया सव्व जीवा सव्वे सत्ता न हन्तव्वा न अभ्भावेयव्वा न परिघे यव्या न परितावे यव्या न किलामियव्वा न उद्दवे यव्या एत्थं पिजाणह न त्थिथ दो सो आयरिय वयण मेयं पुव्वं निकायं समयं पतेयं २ पुछि सामो ऽहंभो पावा दुया किं भे सायं दुखं उदाहू असायं समिया पाडिवन्नेयावि एवं बुया सव्वेसं पाणाणं सव्वे सिंभुयाणं सव्वे सिं जीवाणं सव्वेसिं सत्ताणं असायं अपरिनिवाणं महभयं दुखं ॥ **तिबेमि**"

(श्री आचांर्ग सूत्र, स्कन्ध १ अध्यैन ४ उदेसा २)

E. T. "Some say thus, also the wise ones; the wise ones say thus, also some *others.

Many and several in this world, Brahmanas or Sramans, raise this discussion: We have seen, heard, acknowledged, thoroughly understood, in the upper, nether, and sidelong directions, and in all ways examined it: all sorts of living beings may be slain, or treated with violence, or abused, or tormented, or driven away. Know about this: there is no wrong in it.

That is a doctrine of the unworthy. But those who are teachers, have said: you have wrongly seen, wrongly heard, wrongly acknowledged, wrongly understood, in the upper, nether, and sidelong directions, in all ways wrongly examined it, whenever you say thus, speak thus, declare thus, explain thus:

All sorts of living beings may be slain, or treated with violence, or abused, or tormented, or driven away. Know about this: there is no wrong in it. That is a doctrine of the unworthy.

**By some* is meant the highest class of sages. The meaning is that all professors, high or low, say the same, agree in the doctrine of ahinsa.*

But we say thus, speak thus, declare thus, explain thus:

All sorts of living beings should not be slain, nor treated with violence, nor abused, nor tormented, nor driven away. Know about this, there is no wrong in it.

This is the doctrine of the teachers.

First the persuasion of every one should be ascertained, and then we will ask them severally:

Ye professors! is pain pleasant to you, or unpleasant?

If they give the right answer, reply:

For all sorts of living beings pain is unpleasant, disagreeable, and greatly feared.

Thus I say.

Well, it is quite certain and admitted by all the historians that all the temples on mount Abu are of 1000 or 1500 years old.

So we say that these temples did not exist in the time of Tirthankars, nor were they built by their orders. For this very reason we do not believe in them. Let a reference (order) be quoted from authorised Sutras which correspond to them and

is free from diabolical expression. With this, it should be shown which mountain had a temple dedicated to which Tirthankara on that occasion. All the Munis who devoted themselves to the *self-mortification* on these mountains always did so because of their being quite isolated and free from bustle. Even Tirthankara Maharaj always put up in the temple of Jaksh (Detva). If there were Jin temples, they would not have taken abode in Devtas temples, leaving their own places. There is another point worth consideration. The first and foremost principle of Jain Incarnates (Tirthankaras) was to observe and to preach "Ahinsa Parmo Dharma." With all these premises can it be concluded that they allowed flower (life in them being admitted), water etc, to be offered to Them in Their Tyâg State and regarded lay votaries of these type their true worshippers? It can never be so, because they have repeatedly enjoined upon us not to wear a garland of flower nor to touch it. With these propaganda how could they permit such things for Themselves.

WHO ARE SWETAMBRI.

I WANT to touch upon this point—"Who are Swetambri". Friend, you know well that they are Swetambris who wear white

dress and not those whose dress is yellow and of other colours. Those who have dress of other colours cannot be called Swetambri.

If any body advanced this argument that though Sadhus of this community wear yellow coloured dress, it is a different matter but they all put on white dress and so they cannot be called Pitambri. Upon this I put a question to him to think over it calmly and tell me "Who are called Digambri? And with what characteriste features? Why are they so called? And do the Sarâwaks of Digambri sect live naked?" The answer would be that they do not live naked, but their Sadhus pass their lives in a naked condition and from this very cause they are called Digambri. Hence this very logic is applicable to so called Swetambri. As their Sadhus, who are very much revered and regarded as followers of Sutras to the very letter were yellow clothes. They must be called Pitambris and not Swetambris. Contents of the page 82 of "History and Literature of Jainism" may be pressed forward in defence.

There it is written, that the Sadhus did not wear yellow clothes before, but the change was made in the 17th century by Maharaj Satya Vijaya, Yashovijaya and Ananda Ghana Ji to distinguish themselves from fallen yatis. Well, why is this colour still adhered to? Canno't they now be distinguished from others? Is it so? Or is there any other reason?

If this change in colour was adopted for the above reasons, why does the reformer of the community claim it to be based upon Shastras, while there is nothing of this in them as to making change in colour and the like, according to their own statement given above. If this question of colour is discussed in Sutra, why was the change done by Satya Vijaya, Yasho Vijaya, Anand Ghana and not by their predecessors. Were their gurus etc. igorant of these Sutras or path, that this change was not introduced by them. It is a well-known-fact that one of these points is true. If this were the injunction or order of Shastras, the Acharayas of Swetambaris would have done so long before, but they did not do so, as it is said by you. Now, how

can it be taken in accordance with Shastras? In no way whatever, rather in contradiction to that. Read *Chaturath Astuti Nirne Shankodhar* चतुर्थ स्तुति निरणे शंको धार Page 82,116,120, in which the great Acharya of theirs speak violently against dying clothes. With these precedents in hand, how can we admit your assertion that dying clothes is allowed in Shastras. In spite of this, they write that Satya Vijaya, Yasho, Vijaya, Anand Ghana Ji Maharaj did this in the 17th century to distinguish themselves from other fallen *yatis*. How can this be admitted to be true?

To say briefly, unless this wrong theory (dying cloth is permissible) which is circulated amongst the people is not withdrawn with regret, you can not in any way be called Swetambri, you have done so intentionally and still go on doing it. Well friend, how can you call yourself Swetambri? If you say "We are Pitambri and you are Swetambri. Why has your conference called itself Swetambri Sthanakwasi"? We reply "When *without rhyme or reason* you have assumed the name of Swetambri in every sphere of life, we could not help adding Sthanikwasi to Swetambri for the sake of distinction, otherwise there was no necessity of it, for you are Petambri and we

are Swetambri in reality. This is all, I had no mind to dwell up the subject so much, but circumstances forced me to prolong it.

SOME DIFFERENT OPINIONS IN FAVOUR OF JAINISM.

THE JAINA SHASANA BARARE'S 13TH MAY 1911. Dr. JONNHES HERTEL Ph. D. writes:—

"I was struck by my own discovery, that all the Panchtantra texts, published hitherto in Europe and in India were not as every body thought the works of Brahmans, but of Jains. I am astonished that the value of Jain narrative literature is not yet fully acknowledged among European Scholars."

2. *The religions of the world by John Murdock L. L. D. 1902 Page 128:-*

"The yati has to lead a life of continence; he should wear a thin cloth over his mouth to prevent insects from flying into it, he should strain water through a cloth before drinking and he should carry a broom to sweep the place on which he is about to sit, to remove every living creatures out of the way of danger."

3. History of India for senior classes **by E. Marsdon B. A., F. R. G. S., M. R. A. S. part I. 1910, page 109 :--**

"The Jain monks try to keep the last rule very

fully. So that, they may not kill or hurt even the most tiny insects, they strain the water they drink, they sweep the ground they tread on and even cover their mouths with a cloth lest they should draw in any insect in breathing."

4. Chamber's Encyclopaedia Volume VI London 1906, page 268:--

"The yati has to lead the life of abstinence and continence, he should wear a thin cloth over his mouth to prevent insects from flying into it and he should carry a brush to sweep the place on which (he) is about to sit."

5. The religions of India by A. Barth London 1891, page 145:--

"Not only do the Jains abstain from all kinds of flesh, but the more rigid of them drink only filtered water, breathe only through veil and go sweeping the ground."

6. Indian Wisdom by Monier Williams M.A. London 1875, page 131:-

"DO NOT KILL OR INJURE; which Jains carry preposterious an extreme, that they strain water before drinking it, sweep the ground with a brush

before treading upon it, never eat or drink in the dark and wear muslin before their mouths to prevent the risk of swallowing minute insects."

7. Mr, A. F. Rudolf Hoernle Ph. D. Tubingen, in his English translation of Uvasagadasao, vol. II pape 51, Note No. 144, Write;:

"Text muhapatti, Skr. mukha-patri, lit., 'a leaf for the mouth,' a small piece of cloth, suspended over the mouth to protect it against the entrance of any living thing. See Bhag., p 195, where muha-mottiyam is probably an error for mukh-pattiyam."

There are several sects in Jainism, but the **Swetambar Sthanakwasi** Jain community is older than all others as the above remarks prove.

TENETS OF THE JAINS.

I WOULD now pass a few remarks on the philosophy and tenets of the Jains. According to the Jain philosophy this world exists from enternity and is not created and not kept in order by any one individual being or authority (God.)

It consits of Loka and Aloka.

The Loka is divided into Urdhva-Loka or the Heavens, the Madhava Loka or the Earth, and Patâl Loka or the Hells. There are two things in this world, Jiva (soul) and Ajiva (non-soul.) Jivas are of two kinds:—1. Moving living beings (Tris) 2. Stationary beings (Sthâvara). Again stationary beings (Sthâvara) are subdivided into five kinds, namely:—Earth-jivas, Water-jivas, Fire-jivas, Wind-jivas and Vinâspati-jivas, these all jivas are called ek-indriya, or beings with only one organ of sense, having only four out of ten forces, viz, the sense of touch, force of body, respiration, and duration of life (ayuh).

And Tris (movable beings) are subdivided into four kinds:—1. Dwi-indriya jivas, or beings with only two of the senses have six life forces, viz, touch, taste, force of body, force of speech,—they have a means of communicating among themselves,—capacity of respiration, and duration of life. Protozoa, and shell beings.

2. Tri-indriya jivas, beings with only three senses have the same six with the addition of smell making seven life forces. Lice, bugs, ants.

3. Chatur-indriya, beings with only four senses

have the same seven forces with the addition of eye-sight, making eight. Wasps, bees, scorpions.

4 Panch-indriyas are sub-divided into Shayani punch-indriyas, and Ashayani panch-indriyas.

(a.) Ashayani panch-indriyas with nine life forces have the same eight with the addition of the sense of hearing.

These beings with five senses and no mind (mana) are very minute.

(b.) Shayani panch-indriyas with ten life forces have the same nine, with the addition of the force of mind, making ten. Men, fish, birds, animals.

Of all the panch-indriyas man is the most important, for it is only man who can obtain Nirvâna.

An inhabitant even of the highest heaven cannot obtain Môksha. For being a Jin or Arhat he must be born as man. There are five kinds of ajiva (non-soul), namely:—

1. Matter (pudgalâstikâya),

2. Space (akâsastikâya),

3. An ether, the fulcrum of motion (dharmâstikâya).

4. Another ether, the fulcrum of rest, in the sense of not moving (adharmâstikâya).

5. Time, which is in only a figurative sense a substance (Kâla).

In all these things there is no feeling or consciousness.

Living beings are a combination of jiva or soul and pudgala or matter. This union of the soul with matter is enternal. The Karmas are also matter. The soul under the bondage of the Karmas is moving in a circle of births. The coming of the new Karmas is called Ashrava. Their binding of the soul is called Bandha.

To prevent the coming of the fresh Karmas is called Sambhara.

To get rid of the past Karmas is called Nirjara. The next stage is the complete removal of matter from the soul, or in other words the absolute liberation of the soul (Môksha).

These are the seven Tattvas of the Jains, but if merit (punya) and demerit (pâpa), the results produced by the varying combinations of soul and matter, be considered as separate principles instead

of being included, as they are here, under Bandha, there will be nine principles.

This Jiva, or soul, has eight natural qualities which are not found in other substances; they are—

1. Unlimited knowledge (jnâna);

2. Unlimited undifferentiated knowledge (darsana);

3. Freedom from pain and pleasure (avyâbadha);

4. Right knowledge, and right conviction, (Samyaktva);

5. Eternal life (akshaya-sthiti);

6. Formlessness (arupi);

7. Equality of status, *i. e.* neither high-born nor low-born (aguru-laghu);

8. Infinite capacities of activity (Virya).

The qualities of the soul are infinite or innumerable, but only these eight are mentioned here.

The Karmas are also matter.

They bind the soul and hide all its gunas or qualities. Under the bondage of the Karmas the soul has forgotten itself, and often thinks itself different from what it is. Such a soul is called Bahir-Atma. These Karmas are of eight kinds;—

1. Knowledge-obscuring Karma (jnânâvaraniya Karma);

2. That force (Karma) which is in us which obscures undifferentiated cognition (darsanâvaraniya-Karma);

3. The third is that force in us which results in the feeling of either pleasure or pain (vedaniya-Karma); it abscures the bliss-nature;

4. The fourth is that force (Karma) in us which obstructs the formation of right belief and right conduct, etc. (Mohaniya-Karma);

5. The fifth is the force in us which determines the duration of any particular life-period in the embodied state; it prevents the continuity of the state of life (Ayuh-Karma);

6. The sixth is that Karma, ore force, in us which gives us the various factors of our objective personality, and obscures the nature of the soul which is to be without bodily form (Nâma-Karma);

7. The seventh is that Karma, or force, in the living being which brings it to particular family, surroundings, whether high or low: it obstructs the equality of the status (Gôtra-Karma);

8. The eighth is a force in the living being which acts as an obstacle to doing something good, giving, enjoying good things, etc, when there is the desire to do so (Antarâya-Karma.)

Life and death are nothing but the ending of one Ayu Karma and beginning of another. When one Ayu Karma of a certain living being is over its soul leaves the body, and the living being is said to be dead. The soul enters another body and this is called birth. Thus the soul under the bondage of the Karmas goes on moving from body to body, till the moment comes when it shakes off all its Karmas, and recovering all its gunas (qualities) becomes a Jin, an Arhat, obtains Môksha, and finds eternal bliss in its own self.

Readers, the whole above-mentioned philosophy of Jainism depends upon the solution of the mysterious puzzle, the mysterious enigma, what is I? What is this word? Whence have I come? Where shall I go? What is the end of all these things? This problem has been solved by different Great Men in different countries, in different times, in different ways. No two solutions seem to be the same. This leads to the variety of beliefs and religions.

The Jain Tirthankaras,* the Kshatriya-Rishis of ancient times, have also solved this question in the manner above mentioned. They too have made an answer to the question. "What is I?" "What is this world?" They too have told us that the soul is eternal, the karmas are eternal, the world is eternal. There is no creator. There is no destroyer. As the soul sows so does it reap.

Our fate depends upon ourselves. And, this solution of the Tirthankaras appears to me one of the noblest.

This seems to me to be full of the highest moral virtue. For why should we make our heaven depend upon the worship of God or His sons and deputies? Why should we not make it depend upon our own actions? That God must be a peculiar God who is pleased only with our worshipping Him. We also do not accept God as a judge of our actions, for this gives rise to many objections, and places God in a very awkward position. We, Jains, entertain the highest ideal of God as Sarvajna, eternal, all blissful, &c.

---

* *Vide, Achâranga sutra, Book I, lecture I, lesson I.*

We do not regard him as acceptor of flattery, a being killing one and saving another, a being administering justice despotically in proportion to the amount of flattery and worship. We do not admit him as a judge of our actions. Our God is the highest being, the highest standard for our copy, the highest ideal for our imitation. We recognise man's soul God in man. Those men greatly err who call us Nastikas, as I have shown in Book I. Certainly they are wrong, totally wrong. We are not Nastikas. We believe in God. Only our notion of God is different from that of others. I have said before that the mysterious puzzle, what is I? What is this world? has been differently solved by different Great Men, in different ages, in different climates. The notions of God are also different. Some represent Him as a creator, destroyer and preserver, some say that He judges us only by our faith in His sons and deputies, some say that he judges us in proportion to our worship of Him. Some give one definition of Him and some another.

We have our own definition. We say that He is neither a creator, destroyer and preserver, nor

has He sons and deputies. He is almighty, eternal, omniscient, and has infinite Gunas (qualities). He is the divine soul. We press upon each man his own importance. If every one of us were to realize what he really is and to act up to it, just see, what should have his actions been. Thus we believe in God. Only our notion of Him is different. We give the lie to those men who call us Nastikas. We believe in God. Readers, may I not also ask you in one word if those men do not err who say that the Jains have no philosophy. Have we no philosophy?

Is the above one no philosophy? However, read Madhava's Sarva-Darshana-Sanigraha, and he will tell you if the Jains have no philosophy.

TWELVE BHAVANAS.

EVERY Jain is enjoined to meditate upon the following twelve Subjects. These are called the twelve Bhâvanâs or Anupre-kshas—अनुप्रेक्षा.

1. There is nothing unchangeable in this world. Every thing is subject to alteration. I should not, therefore, pay much importance to it, and should regard it transitory.

This is called Anitya Anupreksha [अनित्य अनुप्रेक्षा].

2. There is none in this world to help me in affliction or at the time of death. I must reap as I have sown.

This is called Asharana Anupreksha [अशरन अनुप्रेक्षा].

3. I have in past lives suffered troubles as a man, a deva, a nârki, or a triyanch. I must now make attempt to free myself from them. This is called Sansâra Anupreksha [संसार अनुप्रेक्षा].

4. I am alone in this world. This is called Ekatva Anupreksha [एकत्व अनुप्रेक्षा].

5. All these things of the world are separate from me. This is called Anyatva-Anupreksha [अन्यत्व अनुप्रेक्षा]

6. What pride should I take in this body which is full of dirty things. This is called Ashuchi Anupreksha [अशुचि अनुप्रक्षा]

7. I should think of those thoughts, words, and actions that give rise to fresh karmas. This is called Ashrava-Anupreksha [आश्रव अनुप्रेक्षा].

8. I should adopt such measures as may prevent

fresh Karmas from binding my soul in future.

This is called Sambhara Anupreksha [सम्बर अनुप्रेक्षा]

9. I should adopt such measures as may help me to shake off my past Karmas. This is called Nirjarâ-Anupreksha [निर्जरा अनुप्रेक्षा]

10. I should think over this world. What does it consist of? What are the Dravyas (substances)? What are the Tattvas, &c? This is called Lôka Anupreksha [लोक अनुप्रेक्षा].

11. In this world all things are easy of acquisition except the Ratna Trayi Dharma. This is called Bôdha-Durlabha Anupreksha [बेाधदुर्लभ अनुप्रेक्षा]

12. Ratna Trayi Dharma is the true source of happiness in this world. This is called Dharma-Anupreksha [धर्म्म अनुप्रेक्षा].

AHINSA PARAMO DHARMAHA.

MY dear readers, now I conclude this subject of mine. It is a matter of great pride to me who being a **Kshatriya** by caste has not only become a **Swetamber-Sthanakwasi Jaini** in all respects, but over and above it a **S. S. Jain Sadhu (Monk).** Jain religion, I dare say, will lead me to the eternal home of bliss.

Would that other religions should have been on the lines of Jainism. I earnestly desire that people would take measures to save the lives of the poor dumb creatures such as cow, ox, goat &c., which are daily slaughtered to feed the meat-eaters. It is my heart-felt craving that those who are given to hunting the helpless deer, peacock &c., would cease to do so. And that every one would make his rule to pursuade people not to kill animals on the occasions of Dushehra and other such festivals.

Alas!!! a good number of goats, &c. is killed for the sake of sacrifice offerings. I assure you, gentlemen, that if the slaughtering of animals will continue on this score, time will soon come when we the Hindus whose back bone of strength is milk and

butter and who abstain from meat, will turn weak and sapless.

Consider a little. Compare the rates of butter and and milk of these days with those of a few years back. A great difference comes to light. For this reason we shall put a stop to animal killing which (animals) will, in turn, be inwardly thankful to us for their lives.

Even if we let our self-interest alone, we should save their lives for the sake of mercy.

O good men, be merciful to the poor creatures.

How cruelly are they put to death for no fault of their own.

To day, there is a goat, a sheep, or a cow.

To-morrow it is no more. Where have they gone?

They are in the stomach of meat-eaters.

Their lives are destroyed for the sake of flesh-eaters, who simply to gratify their desires expose lives of others to risk and danger.

The cows which have been slaughtered would have been a source of great use to many. Dear readers, do you think that the poor animals do not

feel it fearfully that they shall be killed to-morrow?

Do you believe that the animals are unaware that their end is near and that they shall not be any more to-morrow.

Does not the cruel and tyrant killer know that life is dear to all and that they all flee from death and danger?

O mercy! O mercy!! O mercy!!!

I appeal for the sake of mercy and mercy alone.

If we have something like mercy in our nature, let us take the side of the poor animals. See in England A. F. Hills Esqr., D. L., and other gentlemen like Prof. Mayor and Dr. Josiah oldfield have been leading on a movement whose sole object is to save slaughter and to spread Vegetarianism.

Let us have an Indian Vegetarian Federal Union and let us save.

"The lamb thy riot dooms to bleed to day,
Had he thy reason, would he skip and play?
Pleased to the last, he crops the flow'ry food.
And licks the hand just raised to shed his blood"

Gentlemen, remember we are Hindus. We are

the descendants of those Hindus who were Hindus by deeds or from whom hin or hinsa was du or dur, *i. e.*, away; (hin=hinsa and du=dur, *i. e.*, away). Indeed all were not Hindus who lived on the banks of the Indus. Hindus were those who refrained from killing living creatures. Let us see distinctly the explanation of the word Hindu. It is only they who under the control of sense of taste say, that they were the Hindus alone who lived on the banks of the Indus. We, Jains, call Hindus those from whom hin or hinsa is du or dur, *i. e.* away. O! gentlemen, are we not correct? Certainly we are.

Mercy says we are correct. Animals cry we are correct. Let us be what we are.

Let us not pretend to be what we are not. Come let us be true Jains or Hindus. Both are the same in the sense of the word Hindu. Let us propagate the religion of mercy. We must not confine our efforts to India alone, but go abroad to sow the seeds of mercy as is well and befittingly said by Maharaj Asoka "Ahinsa Paramo Dharma"—

Do not kill any living being.

Do not injure or trouble others.

This is the highest form of religion.

1913, was appointed for preparatory ceremony at Maler-Kotla State.

Just before adopting Sadhu position (Muni Briti) on the same day, he delivered a convincing lecture in the presence of nearly 2000 persons, showing in a forcible line:-

"This world is full of miseries, and is momentary like a smell of flower and a buble in an ocean.

This world is without a real hapinesses. One who is born shall certainly die away. A poet also says:-

'The momentary glories waste.
The short-lived beauties die away'

Quite alone have we come here (in this world) and alone shall we go.

No one will go with us. We will leave here what is worldly, viz, son, wife, houses. Pride not yourself, my dear, upon the beauty of body, it is vain and mortal, aspire to the beauty of soul and piety, which shall never wither. Keep

in mind, 'as we sow, so shall we reap'

No one can save us from the jaws of death. No one can relieve us from the pangs of disease.

When we fall ill, our mother, sister, and brother, look at our face but can do nothing.

Only Dharma [good actions] shall go with us. It will be our support at the time of death. Our own self is the doer and undoer of misery and happiness; our own self is our friend and fœ, according as we act well or badly"

That scene was extraordinarily worth seeing. Saying so, he adopted Sadhu position and became the disciple of Sri Swami Ude Chand Ji (Gani).

The preparatory ceremony was celebrated with great pomp and show.

FATU RAM JAINI,
JIONT SECRETARY,
S. S. JAIN SABHA,
LUDHIANA.

FREE! FREE!! FREE!!!

NOTICE.

Mans-Bhakshan Nished part Ist and 2nd (in Urdu) by PREM CHAND JAIN MUNI late name (NANAK CHAND).

These tracts contain convincing rational proofs and religious quotations taken from sacred books of all sects and communities to

show the evils of "flesh eating" On receipt of half anna's stamp Lala Fatu Ram Secretry S. S. Jain Sabha Ludhiana city will send part I. and II.

---:-o-:---

B. DHUMI RAM JAINI,

B. A., S. A. V.

OM.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

AMRIT NAITRANJAN is a specific for all kinds of Eye Diseases. Its efficacy has been tried by Doctors and Physicians on hundreds of patients suffering from GRANULARLIDS CATRACT OPACITY OF CORNEA and the FALLING OF HAIR.

Charitable persons have used it to relieve the suffering poor. It is a necessary for every home.

Price 1 tola Rs. 2/- ½ tola Rs. 1/- ¼ tola As. -/8/-

Amrit Durâb is the surest remedy for IMPOTENCY EMISSIONS PALPITATION OF HEART WEAKNESS and GENERAL DEBILITY. A few days use will convince you of its worth prices:—

One Bottle Rs. 1/-. Half Bottle As. -/9/-

All orders should be addressed to:—

S. R. SHARMA, Medical Hall,
P. SRI RAM, Medical Practitioner,
LUDHIANA.

TRUE COPIES
OF
AMRIT NAITARA ANJANA.

I was suffering from granulids and the falling of hair into the eyes. Pandit Sri Ram asked me to give a trial to his—Amrit Naitranjan and I used

it for about two months. During this period two or three hair that fell into my eyes were taken out. Ever since I have had no complaint of the kind. My eyes have been also partly relieved of granulids which were of a very long standing. I congratulate Pandit Sri Ram on such a useful production and recommend it to the appreciation of the public.

(Sd.) AMIR CHAND, B.A., L.L.B.
Science Master, Arya High School,
LUDHIANA.

MY DEAR DR. SRI RAM JI.

I am very glad to say that your Amrit Naitra Anjan proved to me most useful in my case when I was suffering from acute pain of granulids and sty.

Sd. B. DILA RAM, B. A. L. L. B.,
Pleader Ludhiana.

I have tried Pundit Sri Ram's Surma on a few cases. It is most useful for granularlids and opacity of the cornea.

Sd. Dr. UDHAI BHAN,
Asstt, Surgeon Ludhiana.

I certify that I have tested and experienced the the Surma of Pandit Sri Ram of Ludhiana and found it very officacious and curing chronic granulids opacity of cornea and Pterysium.

Sd. Dr. MAYA DASS,
N. W. RAILWAY,
Ferozpore city.